## Theresa Rice

**From:** Roz Lassoff on behalf of Council
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 08, 2013 11:06 AM
**To:** Kathy Cook; Ryan Ericson; Theresa Rice
**Subject:** FW: citizen input-approve SMP and forward to WA DoE
**Attachments:** CoBI_citizen input for SMP approval.pdf

Roz Lassoff
Rosalind D. Lassoff, City Clerk
City of Bainbridge Island
280 Madison Avenue North
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
(206) 780-8624

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathy [mailto:kwolf.info@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 7:50 AM
To: Council
Subject: citizen input-approve SMP and forward to WA DoE

Dear Councilmembers,

I urge you to approve the draft SMP and forward the document to the Department of Ecology for review. The attached document contains more detailed comments and support for SMP approval.

Best Regards,

Kathy Wolf
11224 Parkhill Pl NE
(near Rolling Bay)

**To: City of Bainbridge Island Councilmembers**
**From: Kathleen Wolf, Ph.D.; resident at Parkhill Place NE (near Rolling Bay)**
**Date: May 7, 2013**
**Re: Approve SMP**

**I urge the city council to approve the SMP and send it to the WA Dept. of Ecology for agency review.**

I am a Puget Sound native resident, born of parents who lived their adult lives in the Puget Sound basin. This legacy is my 'skin in the game'. The Puget Sound is a resource that is shared by millions of people, most of whom do not have the means to afford shoreline property (me included). Across the mid Sound I have watched the decline of fish stocks, beach quality, and water quality in just several generations.

I ask you to approve the SMP without further revision as its content has been thoroughly studied, reviewed and revised, including measures to accommodate the interests of shoreline property owners. I want our community to be a leader in the regional efforts toward shoreline and landscape management for Puget Sound recovery.

The SMP does not simply address a single threat (e.g. stormwater) to the Puget Sound but acknowledges the diverse and interconnected influences of landscapes that are in and adjacent to the nearshore area. I have been told the claims of possible negative impacts to shoreline owners. I am a research social scientist, holding joint appointments with the University of Washington, and the USDA Forest Service Pacific NW Research Station. My research addresses the psychological and social responses of people to outdoor landscapes and ecosystems. I am not as qualified to weigh in on the ecological science of the plan, but I offer information from social science studies that are relevant to the SMP, and that addresses property owner concerns.

Thank you for your consideration of this request, and the evidence-based points that follow.

## Human Dimensions of Residential Shoreline Management

### Ecological Aesthetic

In recent decades there is a growing effort to develop the principles of ecological aesthetics[1] in recognition that landscapes must be multi-functional, that they must be a complementary blend of ecosystem functions and beauty.[2] Certain elements consistently elicit positive visual reactions to landscapes (such as large trees and water), but the arrangement of the elements is equally important to aesthetic judgments, including built-to-nature balance.[3]

### Design Principles to Enhance Ecological Aesthetics

Studies have been done to test public acceptability of naturalistic landscapes. Certain principles of landscape 'framing' generate attractive residential landscapes.[4] When framed by particular cultural elements, such as low fences or mown edges, naturalistic landscapes are perceived to be intentional and valued. A subtle, ecological landscape language makes care apparent, and communicates management intentions.[5] Neatness counts; there are design strategies that instill ecological plantings with more order which is often more visually appealing.[6]

### Emerging Biodiversity Preferences

Residential is the major land cover for most communities. Thus, as with Bainbridge Island's shoreline, homeowner actions on the land have major cumulative affects. Recent studies are attempting to gauge both understanding and appreciation of biodiversity in yard landscapes.[7] [8] [9] Adoption of ecological design principles by a few homeowners can change the cultural norms of a neighborhood, with more people willing to try landscape innovations for ecological purposes.[10] Broader adoption of ecological aesthetics can telegraph that people care, given growing knowledge of ecological concerns, changing a community's landscape expectations.[11] [12]

### Naturalistic Landscapes and Property Values

Landscape affects property values, and has been measured by economists using a method called hedonic analysis. Quality landscapes that display owner attention and care boost property values. Larger trees are associated with

higher values.[13] [14] [15] The findings (though preliminary) of the most recent studies are that biodiversity and proximity to natural amenities can boost property prices.[16] For instance, improved bird habitat is a marker for landscapes that enhance property value.[17] Given recent educational focus on sustainability, new younger buyers may be particularly interested in more naturalistic landscapes.

**Sustainability and Resilience**

Finally, many local governments are increasingly interested in sustainability and resilience and how these concepts are expressed on the ground, at the parcel level. Such policy is a necessity (not simply a preference) that addresses public welfare, and generates savings for city budgets. Ecological functions are 'green infrastructure' functions that displace the costs of installing the pipes and concrete of 'gray infrastructure'. There is growing recognition that design with nature generates a variety of benefits and services for property owners, as well as for the broader community. For instance, given projections of rising water levels and the impacts of winter storms, communities all around the country are revisiting the use of native vegetation and natural soils to buffer storm effects. The SMP may help protect shoreline properties in the long run.

---

[1] Koh, J. 1988. An Ecological Aesthetic. Landscape Journal 7, 2: 177-191.

[2] Gobster, P.H., J.I. Nassauer, T.C. Daniel, and G. Fry. 2007. The Shared Landscape: What Does Aesthetics Have to Do with Ecology? Landscape Ecology 22, 7: 959-972.

[3] Kaplan, R., and S. Kaplan. 1989. The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective. Cambridge University Press, New York.

[4] Nassauer, J.I., Z. Wang, and E. Dayrell. 2009. What Will the Neighbors Think? Cultural Norms and Ecological Design. Landscape and Urban Planning 92, 3-4: 282-292.

[5] Nassauer, J.I. 1995. Messy Ecosystems, Orderly Frames. Landscape Journal 14: 161-170.

[6] Zheng, B., Y. Zhang, and J. Chen. 2011. Preference to Home Landscape: Wildness or Neatness? Landscape and Urban Planning 99: 1-8.

[7] Kurz, T., and C. Baudains. 2012. Biodiversity in the Front Yard An Investigation of Landscape Preference in a Domestic Urban Context. Environment and Behavior 44, 2: 166-196.

[8] Williams, K.J.H., and J. Cary. 2002. Landscape Preferences, Ecological Quality, and Biodiversity Protection. Environment and Behavior 34, 2: 257-274.

[9] Goddard, M.A., A.J. Dougill, and T.G. Benton. 2010. Scaling Up From Gardens: Biodiversity Conservation in Urban Environments. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 25, 2: 90-98.

[10] Nassauer, J.I., Z. Wang, and E. Dayrell. 2009. What Will the Neighbors Think? Cultural Norms and Ecological Design. Landscape and Urban Planning 92, 3-4: 282-292.

[11] Nassauer, J.I. 2011. Care and Stewardship: From Home to Planet. Landscape and Urban Planning 100, 4: 321-23.

[12] Goddard, M.A., A.J. Dougill, and T.G. Benton. 2013. Why Garden for Wildlife? Social and Ecological Drivers, Motivations and Barriers for Biodiversity Management in Residential Landscapes. Ecological Economics 86, 258-273.

[13] Morales, D.J. 1980. The Contribution of Trees to Residential Property Value. Journal of Arboriculture 6, 11: 305-308.

[14] Dombrow, J., M. Rodriguez, and C.F. Sirmans. 2000. The Market Value of Mature Trees in Single-Family Housing Markets. Appraisal Journal 68, 1: 39-43.

[15] Donovan, G.H., and D.T. Butry. 2010. Trees in the City: Valuing Street Trees in Portland, Oregon. Landscape and Urban Planning 94, 2: 77-83.

[16] Gibbons, S., S. Mourato, and G. Resende. 2011. SERC Discussion Paper 74. The Amenity Value of English Nature: A Hedonic Price Approach. 31 pp.

[17] Farmer, M.C., M.C. Wallace, and M. Shiroya. 2013. Bird Diversity Indicates Ecological Value in Urban Home Prices. Urban Ecosystems 16, 1: 131-144.